# Exhibit 30

```
STATE OF ILLINOIS )
 2
                    )
                        SS:
 3
    COUNTY OF C O O K )
         IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
 4
             COUNTY DEPARTMENT - CHANCERY DIVISION
 5
 6
 7
   BYRON BARRETT, individually and on
   behalf of all others similarly
 8
                                             ORIGINAL
    situated,
10
                      Plaintiffs,
11
                                         )NO. 07 CH 20924
12
   RC2 CORPORATION,
13
                      Defendant.
14
15
             TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had in the
   above-entitled cause on the 29th day of January,
16
17
   A.D. 2008, at 10:55 a.m.
18
19
   BEFORE: HONORABLE WILLIAM O. MAKI.
20
21
22
23
24
```

1	APPEARANCE:
2	HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO, LLP.,
3	(820 North Boulevard, Suite B,
4	Oak Park, Illinois 60302,
5	708-776-5600), by:
6	MS. ELIZABETH A. FEGAN and
7	MR. DANIEL J. KUROWSKI,
8	appeared on behalf of the Plaintiffs and
9	Intervenors;
10	
11	KAMBEREDELSON, LLC,
12	(53 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 1530,
13	Chicago, Illinois 60604,
14	312-589-6378), by:
15	MR. JAY EDELSON and MR. STEVEN LEZELL,
16	appeared on behalf of the Plaintiffs;
17	
18	TABET DiVITO & ROTHSTEIN,
19	(The Rookery Building, 209 S. LaSalle Street,
20	7th Floor,
21	Chicago, Illinois 60604,
22	312-762-9460), by:
23	MR. GINO L. DiVITO,
24	appeared on behalf of the Plaintiffs;

Г	
1	APPEARANCE:
2	
3	ICE MILLER, LLP.,
4	(2300 Cabot Drive, Suite 455,
5	Lisle, Illinois 60532,
6	630-955-6392), by:
7	MR. BART T. MURPHY,
8	appeared on behalf of the Defendant.
9	
10	ALSO PRESENT:
11	
12	SHEFSKY & FROELICH, LTD.,
13	(111 East Wacker Drive, Suite 2800,
14	Chicago, Illinois 60601,
15	312-836-4071), by:
16	MR. TIMOTHY J. EATON and MR. JAMES WILSON;
17	
18	KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER, LLP.,
19	(350 Sansome Street,
20	San Francisco, California 94104,
21	415-772-4700), by:
22	MR. LAURENCE D. KING.
23	REPORTED BY: MIGDALIA MONTERO, C.S.R.
24	Certificate No. 84-4383.

1	December 10th settlement offer, a formal demand that
2	they made to the defendant.
3	I think what they don't realize is we had
4	already reached a settlement on, I believe, November
5	30th in front of Judge Boharic. We had a memorandum
6	of understanding and all these terms of the
7	settlement, and then we were just writing it up. As
8	Counsel knows, it takes sometime to write up these
9	complex settlement agreements. So there was a
10	situation where the defendant wasn't pitting one
11	side against the other. We, in fact, asked for
12	repeated assurances during the settlement process
13	THE COURT: Can I just interject here for a
14	question at this point? One of the matters that
15	Hagens Berman raises on Page 10 of their brief that
16	they filed today, it says, "Defendant did not appear
17	in the case until January 24th, 2008, after
18	preliminary approval was granted." Is that true?
19	MR. MURPHY: It's true, Your Honor. I didn't
20	file my appearance until then. It wasn't
21	intentional. I just realized it was an oversight
22	that I hadn't filed an appearance until that time.
23	THE COURT: So it was an oversight?
24	MR. MURPHY: Yes.

1 THE COURT: When did you file it? 2 MR. MURPHY: January 24th. I believe it was the 24th, possibly the 23rd, whatever the date they 3 allege in one of their -- I'm not sure if it was the 4 5 23rd or 24th. 6 MR. EDELSON: That actually goes to an important point, where they try to create this 7 impression that we were keeping everybody in the 8 That's not true. When we filed our case in 9 dark. Cook County, the case got substantial press. 10 11 think it was the "Case of the Day" in the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin. Our co-counsel, Bill Audet, put 12 the information about this case on his website. 13 I spoke at a symposium, where I talked about -- I 14 actually compared this case to the pet food case 15 that we have with Hagens Berman. When the press has 16 asked me about these types of issues, I have talked 17 18 about it. The idea that we were in anyway hiding these cases, it's just not true. But again, I'm 19 starting to believe this isn't a matter of Hagens 20 Berman making things up. I just think they are just 21 22 misinformed. 23 Back to what is actually before the 24 Court, Hagens Berman has at a lot of different

#### TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, JANUARY 29, 2008 BYRON BARRETT -VS- RC2 CORPORATION

absolutely this Court and Judge Leinenweber should have the opportunity to coordinate and figure out how these issues are going to be unraveled.

Ultimately, Your Honor, the objection date and the final approval date wasn't until sometime in April, so taking an extra seven days or fourteen days to make sure these issues are worked out now is going to save everybody time in the long run and will still get everybody to the end game. So the harm here, Your Honor, isn't pushing ahead merely because they want to push ahead quickly so that the issues can't be heard.

MR. MURPHY: Your Honor, since some allegations are being leveled against me and we are on the record, I would like to respond real briefly. I don't want to waste everyone's time here.

about it, I believe I did commit last week, and not me, my client actually paid. What I committed to yesterday was releasing the proof, so that it can go to the printer. So the actual monies had to be wired to the ad agency last week I believe, if we want to be technical about it, which Ms. Fegan is evidently interested in being technical about it.